

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Enright v. Centene Management Company, LLC d/b/a Health Net
Federal Services, LLC

No. 25cv0796-LL-MSB (S.D. Cal. June 27, 2025) · No. 25cv0796-LL-MSB · Decided June 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California denied Paul C. Enright’s motion to remand his employment-law action against Centene Management Company, LLC to state court. The court held that diversity jurisdiction existed because the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 and the parties were completely diverse, and it denied the related motion to stay as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Linda Lopez
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	June 27, 2025
DOCKET	25cv0796-LL-MSB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to remand an employment-law action removed from San Diego Superior Court on diversity-jurisdiction grounds and also moved to stay the case pending resolution of the remand motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The removing defendant bears the burden of establishing that removal is proper; remand is required if the federal court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction after removal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is unknown.
PARTIES	Paul C. Enright v. Centene Management Company, LLC d/b/a Health Net Federal Services, LLC

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- wrongful termination
- employment law

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 for purposes of diversity jurisdiction.
2. Whether the parties were completely diverse for purposes of diversity jurisdiction.
3. Whether the removed action should be remanded to state court.
4. Whether Plaintiff's motion to stay should be granted while the remand motion was pending.

HOLDINGS

1. The amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 because the complaint's allegations of more than three years of lost wages, bonuses, benefits, and other compensation, combined with its other damages requests, made the jurisdictional amount facially apparent; the removal petition independently supported that amount.
2. Complete diversity existed because Plaintiff was a California citizen and the defendant LLCs' citizenship, determined through their membership layers, was Delaware and Missouri rather than California.
3. The motion to remand was denied because the court possessed original diversity jurisdiction over the action and removal was proper.
4. The motion to stay was denied as moot because the court resolved the remand motion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because there is a “strong presumption” against removal, “the defendant always has the burden of establishing removal is proper.”” (1)

“An “LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens.”” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a former healthcare analyst, alleged that Defendant unlawfully terminated him in December 2021. He sought compensatory, general, and punitive damages, including damages for lost wages, bonuses, benefits, and other compensation. Although the complaint did not state a specific damages amount, the court concluded that more than three years of alleged lost compensation, together with the other requested damages, placed more than \$75,000 in controversy. Plaintiff was domiciled in California, while the defendant entities' members were alleged to be citizens of Delaware and Missouri.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Enright sued Centene Management Company, LLC in San Diego Superior Court for alleged violations of California employment laws. Defendant timely removed the action to the Southern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1441, asserting diversity jurisdiction. The district court denied the motion to remand and denied the motion to stay as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Singer v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 116 F.3d 373, 377 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger, 437 U.S. 365, 373 (1978)
- Lew v. Moss, 797 F.2d 747, 749-50 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 559 U.S. 77, 88 (2010)
- Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Traeger Grills E., LLC v. Traeger Pellet Grills, LLC, No. 11-cv-0536-AC, 2011 WL 115439330, at *3 (D. Or. Nov. 9, 2011)
- Mason & Dixon Intermodal, Inc. v. Lapmaster Int'l LLC, 632 F.3d 1056, 1060 (9th Cir. 2011)